

Remarks

Claims 22, 33, 37 and 38 have been amended to more clearly define the invention.

Claims 22-38 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over US 2004/0193513 to Pruss et al. in view of US 2003/0157925 to Sorber et al. The Examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection in view of this amendment.

This application relates to a method and system for processing user requests for credit based local area network access, in which a user is given an opportunity to re-authenticate access when the user account runs low. Nowhere does Pruss et al show or suggest:

“said access point notifying said user device when said credit parameter reaches a threshold value”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 22 as amended. Rather, in Pruss et al, gateway GGSN 106 sends a re-authorization request on behalf of the user when the authorized value or “quota” reaches zero. The difference between a *gateway* and an *access point* is well known. A gateway provides a link between two networks, whereas an access point provides a link between a device and a network. It is clear that a gateway can not be equated with an access point.

Similarly, Sorber et al does not show an access point. Rather, Sorber et al shows a gateway GGSN 120. It is therefore clear that Pruss et al and Sorber et al, taken either separately or together, do not affect the patentability of Claim 22 as amended.

Claims 23 to 26 are dependent from Claim 22 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 22.

Similarly, nowhere does either Pruss et al or Sorber et al show or suggest:

“an access point receiving user credentials associated with said user request for credit based wireless local area network access”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 33 as amended. Nowhere does either Pruss et al or Sorber et al show either a wireless local area network nor an access point. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 33 is not affected by Pruss et al or Sorber et al, taken either separately or in combination.

Claims 34 to 36 are dependent from Claim 33 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 33.

Similarly, nowhere do Pruss et al. show or suggest:

“an access point associated with said wireless local area network”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 37. Rather, as set forth above, neither Pruss et al nor Sorber et al. shows a wireless local area network or an access point. Pruss et al shows gateway GGSN 106, which is not an access point. Sorber et al shows gateway GGSN 120, which is also not an access point. It is therefore clear that Pruss et al and Sorber et al, taken either separately or in combination, do not affect the patentability of Claim 37.

Claim 27 is dependent from Claim 37 and adds a further advantageous feature. The Applicants submit that Claim 27 is patentable as its parent Claim 37.

Similarly, nowhere do Pruss et al show or suggest:

“said authentication server transmits to an access point of said wireless local area network”,

as specifically recited in Claim 38. Rather, as set forth above, neither Pruss et al nor Sorber et al. shows a wireless local area network or an access point. Pruss et al shows Gateway GGSN 106, which is not an access point. Sorber et al shows GGSN 120 which is also not an access point. It is therefore clear that Pruss et al and Sorber et al, taken either separately or in combination, do not affect the patentability of Claim 38.

Claims 28 to 32 are dependent from Claim 38, and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 38.

No fee is believed to have been incurred by virtue of this amendment, other than the fee for an extension of the period for response, and the fee for an RCE . However if a further fee is incurred on the basis of this amendment, please charge such fee against Deposit Account 07-0832.

The Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sachin Satish Mody,  
Saurabh Mathur,  
Charles Chuanming Wang

/Daniel E. Sragow/

---

by Daniel E. Sragow  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 22,856  
609/734-6832

THOMSON Licensing Inc.  
Patent Operation  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 1 July 2010